

ORIGINAL

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW • Washington, DC 20037-1526

Tel (202) 785-9700 • Fax (202) 887-0689

Writer's Direct Dial: (202) 828-2290

B4530.0017

September 13, 2000

BY HAND

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20054


Re: CC Dkt. No. 96-98

Dear Ms. Salas:

On September 12, 2000, David Scott, President and CEO of Birch Telecom, Inc., Richard Burk, President and CEO of nii communications, Joseph Gillan, representing the PACE Coalition, and Jacob Farber of this law firm met with Jordan Goldstein of Commissioner Ness' office. We discussed the need for an elimination or reduction of the restriction on the availability of switching as an unbundled network element in density zone 1 of the top 50 MSAs. We reiterated the positions taken in the petition for reconsideration filed by Birch Telecom and the subsequent ex parte letters filed by the PACE Coalition in this docket. We distributed the attached material.

If you need any further information or have any questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,


Jacob Farber

cc: Jordan Goldstein w/o encl.

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List A B C D E

The Birch Analysis¹ Estimates When A Customer Has Sufficient Analog Lines To Be Served Less Expensively Through A High-Speed Digital Facility.

Birch Analysis

Lines	UNE-P Monthly ²	DS-1		
		12 Month	24 Month	36 Month
12	\$173.82	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
13	\$188.27	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
14	\$202.72	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
15	\$217.17	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
16	\$231.62	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
17	\$246.07	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
18	\$260.52	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
19	\$274.97	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
20	\$289.42	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
21	\$303.87	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
22	\$318.32	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
23	\$332.77	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18
24	\$347.22	\$283.45	\$238.17	\$227.18

Area where DS-1 is less costly than loops.

¹ The Birch Analysis was filed by Birch Telecom in its reply to oppositions to its petition for reconsideration in this proceeding.

² The Birch Analysis does not include SBC's port costs or Birch's costs for its self-provisioned switch port, backhaul, interoffice transport, or the costs associated with call termination. These exclusions are equivalent to assuming that Birch's network is at least as (actually more) efficient as SBC's network, even though as a new entrant Birch is not able to achieve any of the scale economies of SBC.

**Updating the Birch Analysis to Include the Additional Cost of An EEL
Substantially Increases the Economic Crossover**

Lines	UNE-P Monthly	DS-1 EEL		
		12 Month	24 Month	36 Month
16	\$231.62	\$358.70	\$305.09	\$291.34
17	\$246.07	\$358.70	\$305.09	\$291.34
18	\$260.52	\$358.70	\$305.09	\$291.34
19	\$274.97	\$358.70	\$305.09	\$291.34
20	\$289.42	\$358.70	\$305.09	\$291.34
21	\$303.87	\$358.70	\$305.09	\$291.34
22	\$318.32	\$358.70	\$305.09	\$291.34
23	\$332.77	\$358.70	\$305.09	\$291.34
24	\$347.22	\$358.70	\$305.09	\$291.34

Area where
DS-1 is
less costly.

Conclusions from the Birch Analysis

1. Due to the high non-recurring charges to establish a high-capacity arrangement, this alternative is only viable in a contract environment, which ensures a sufficient time period for cost recovery.
2. The initial Birch Analysis evaluates only the cost to serve customers whose loops terminate at Birch's collocation arrangement. If the additional costs of an Enhanced Extended Link (EEL) are included, the crossover increases substantially to approximately 21 (three year contract) or 22 (two year contract) lines. One year contracts are not of sufficient duration to amortize the additional nonrecurring costs of establishing an EEL.³
3. The Birch Analysis is deliberately conservative. Actual crossovers are likely to be higher. Given the conservative nature of the Birch Analysis, and customer resistance to committing to long-term contracts with new entrants, the Commission should not base any impairment decision on contracts longer than 2 years.

³ The analysis includes only the fixed monthly and nonrecurring costs to establish a DS1 EEL of one mile in length. Longer EELs incur additional mileage-related costs that would increase the crossover, albeit slowly.

**The 3 Line Restriction Creates A "Lost Market"
Of Business Customers that Would Be Served by UNE-P**

Number of Lines with Account	Distribution of Market (Ameritech) ⁴	Access Method	Distribution of Market Served by UNE-P Carriers Today ⁵	
			PACE #1	PACE #2
3 or less	20.6%	UNE-P Available	24.8%	36.6%
4 to 20	32.6%	The "Lost Market"	62.2%	60.3%
More than 20	46.8%	Sufficiently Large for DS-1	13.0%	3.1%

Conclusions of Market Analysis

- * The 3 line restriction will deny competition to nearly a third of the business market in the top 50 MSAs.
- * The California Small Business Association estimates that approximately 74% of small businesses in that state have between 4 and 20 lines.⁶
- * Increasing the line restriction to 20 lines would still restrict UNE-P from being used to serve nearly 50% of the business lines in the top 50 MSAs.

SBC's Texas §271 Application Confirms the Coalition's Economic Analysis

"SWBT recommends the use of the CHC [coordinated hot cut] process *when 20 or more UNE loops* are to be converted at a single end user's address ... The CHC process is normally necessary only *for larger size business customers where the amount of existing competition is much greater.*"⁷

⁴ Compiled from Ameritech *Ex Parte*, CC Docket No. 96-98, filed September 3, 1999.

⁵ Statistics based on the actual line distributions of two PACE Coalition members serving business customers today, unimpaired by the line restriction.

⁶ *Ex Parte* letter from the California Small Business Association, CC Docket 96-45, filed March 10, 1997.

⁷ Reply Affidavit of Candy R. Conway, Texas Public Service Commission, CC Docket No. 00-4, paragraph 42 (citing Conway Affidavit, paragraph 79) (emphasis supplied).

**The PACE Coalition Proposal Will Result in *More* Lines Being Restricted From
Being Served with Unbundled Local Switching than the Current Rule**

Current Rule: In the top 50 MSAs where EELs are available, unbundled local switching cannot be used to serve customers with more than 3 lines served by a Zone 1 central office in the MSA.

Estimated Impact of Limitation

Criteria	Percent Affected
Customers with > 3 lines ⁸	79.4%
Percent of Market in Zone 1 ⁹	40.2%
Lines subject to Limitation	31.9%

Proposed Rule: In the top 50 MSAs where EELs are available, unbundled local switching cannot be used to serve customers with more than 20 lines at *any* central office in the MSA.

Estimated Impact of Limitation

Criteria	Percent Affected
Customers with > 20 lines ¹	46.8%
Limitation Applies to Entire MSA	100.0%
Lines subject to Limitation	46.8%

Although the rule proposed by the PACE Coalition results in *more* lines being restricted from access to unbundled local switching, the proposed rule rationally relates the limitation to the impairment faced by entrants.

⁸ Estimated from Ameritech *Ex Parte*, CC Docket No. 96-98, filed September 3, 1999,.

⁹ Estimate of the weighted average number of lines in Zone 1 offices for Ameritech, Bell Atlantic (South), BellSouth, Pacific Bell and US West. The percentage of switched lines for these RBOCs included in Zone 1 was provided by Ad Hoc in their Comments on the original Zone Density Plan proposals filed by the ILECs. The weighted average was calculated using total SLC demand for these companies as reported in the September 1, 1999 *Ex Parte* filed by CALLS in support of its proposal in Docket No. 96-262.